

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

### REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending. Claims 1, 13, 21, 25, and 27 have been amended for clarification purposes only to incorporate the changes suggested by the Patent Office. Additionally, claim 21 has been amended to incorporate subject matter from claim 25. Accordingly, the amendment to these claims should raise no new issues nor require further search or consideration. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added and it is respectfully requested that the amendment to the claims be entered.

Claims 1 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because of the recitation of the term "actual data" and "the information." Applicant believes that the amendment to claims 1, 13, 21, and 25 has overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nii in view of Kori.

Claim 1 recites "A display security system comprising a display device comprising an electrical display, a file with encrypted data used to convey information within the encrypted file, a system for displaying the encrypted data on the display, and a decryption key receiver; and a key FOB adapted to transmit a decryption key to the decryption key receiver of the display device, wherein the display device is adapted to display the encrypted data on the display in a decrypted form when the receiver receives the decryption key from the key FOB, and **wherein the display device is adapted to display markings other than in non-encrypted form on the display when the receiver does not receive the decryption key from the key FOB.**"

Claim 13 recites "A display system comprising a frame adapted to be placed at a user's head; a display screen attached to the frame and located in front of a user's eye; a first receiver connected to the frame for receiving a wireless signal having a decryption key; a system connected to the first receiver for decrypting encrypted signals and displaying information contained in the encrypted signals on the display screen, the decrypting system comprising a memory and a system for temporarily storing the decryption key received by the receiver in the memory, wherein non-encrypted data used to convey information within an encrypted file is always displayed, wherein the decrypting system requires a predetermined decryption key in the

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

memory in order for the decryption system to decrypt the encrypted signals, **wherein encrypted data is displayed in non-encrypted form when the decryption key is received and is otherwise displayed as markings other than in non-encrypted form.**”

Claim 25 recites “A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodied in a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform its method steps, for displaying data on an electronic display screen comprising steps of determining if a predetermined decryption key has been received from a key FOB; and if the predetermined decryption key has been received from the key FOB, applying the decryption key to encrypted data and displaying the data on a display screen in a non-encrypted form; **if the predetermined decryption key has not been received from the key FOB, displaying the data on the display screen in a form selected from the group consisting of markings other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled text other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled numbers other than in the non-encrypted form, and symbols other than in the non-encrypted form.**”

The Patent Office asserted (page 5, lines 6-18, of the Final Office Action dated February 21, 2006) “Nii does not disclose that when a proper decryption key is not received, the system will display markings other than the decrypted data. In other words, Nii does not disclose *and wherein the display device is adapted to display markings other than actual data on the display when the receiver does not receive decryption key from key FOB*. However, it would have been obvious, based upon logical reasoning, to visually display markings that might be interpreted as such that the decryption key for decrypting the data desired by a user has not been provided to the system, or would otherwise be seen in place of desired content. Furthermore, this method was well known in the art of content display systems. For example, the content display system of Kori discloses that a display unit should display markings (scrambled content) other than the decrypted content desired by the user when the system is not provided with the correct decryption key (Kori, par. 30, 40).”

Applicant has reviewed base reference Nii and secondary reference Kori. Nii discloses “a display controller 129 to convert the decrypted data 132 to analog signals 133 for application to a display device 130” (paragraph 0060), “a consumption label (CLB) 507 identifies the data file 101 for the user, for example through a display on the user terminal 40” (paragraph 0099), and “a flow chart of a method of receiving and displaying data in accordance with the present invention”

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

(paragraph 0104, figure 20). Nii, in Figure 20, shows a data file is received, the received data file is stored, a key is received from a coupled IC card, the data file is decrypted, data is decoded, and the data is displayed. Nii does not disclose or fairly suggest that the data may not be decrypted before being displayed. Nii does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper IC card.

Kori discloses (paragraph 0040) that an image signal with copyrighted or copy protected contents is authenticated and decrypted, then displayed. Nii does not appear to be concerned with displaying copyrighted or copy protected data. Thus, one of obvious skill would not modify Nii by Kori because the intended environments of use of Nii (i.e., kiosks) are unlikely to be favored if they were to displayed data in its encrypted form and, also, because Nii expresses no need or desire for the display of copyrighted or copy protected data.

Thus, claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, and 25 are allowable over Nii in view of Kori

The Patent Office rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nii in view of Doyle.

The Patent Office appears to consider Kori to no longer be necessary in rejecting claim 7 although claim 7 depends from claims 1 and 6, both of which were rejected over Nii in view of Kori.

Claim 7 recites "A display security system as in claim 6 wherein the key FOB comprises a biometric sensor." Nii does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper decryption key. Doyle, directed to biometric sensors in pervasive devices, does not remedy this deficiency. Nii also does not appear to express a need or desire to incorporate a biometric sensor. Thus, claim 7 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 8 is allowable because it depends from allowable claim 7.

The Patent Office rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

Nii, in view of Klemba.

The Patent Office appears to consider Kori to no longer be necessary in rejecting claim 26 although claim 26 depends from claim 1, which was rejected over Nii in view of Kori.

Claim 26 recites “A display security system as in claim 1, wherein **a circuit inside the key FOB self-destructs if it is determined that an attempt to disassemble the key FOB is made.**”

Nii does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper decryption key. Klemba is directed to a cryptographic framework in which national flag cards are installed in a cryptographic unit (abstract) and does not remedy the deficiency of Nii, as discussed above. Thus, claim 26 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 21, 22, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nii, in view of Fairman.

Claim 21 recites “A method of displaying encrypted data used to convey information within an encrypted file on an electronic display screen comprising steps of providing a key FOB with a decryption key; transmitting the decryption key from the key FOB to a device containing the electronic display screen; applying the decryption key to the encrypted data to decrypt the encrypted information; displaying the decrypted data on the display screen; **if the predetermined decryption key has not been received from the key FOB, displaying the data on the display screen in a form selected from the group consisting of markings other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled text other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled numbers other than in the non-encrypted form, and symbols other than in the non-encrypted form; and sending a different decryption key seed to a user if security is determined to be compromised.**”

Nii discloses “a display controller 129 to convert the decrypted data 132 to analog signals

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

133 for application to a display device 130” (paragraph 0060), “a consumption label (CLB) 507 identifies the data file 101 for the user, for example through a display on the user terminal 40” (paragraph 0099), and “a flow chart of a method of receiving and displaying data in accordance with the present invention” (paragraph 0104, figure 20). Nii, in Figure 20, shows a data file is received, the received data file is stored, a key is received from a coupled IC card, the data file is decrypted, data is decoded, and the data is displayed. Nii discloses (paragraph 0060) a first key and a second key but does not appear to disclose “a decryption key” nor “sending a different decryption key seed to a user if security is determined to be compromised.” Fairman discloses (col. 7, lines 1-9) an encrypted seed value that is transmitted to the customer terminal and that is decrypted by the secure module. Fairman does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest “a decryption key” nor “sending a different decryption key seed to a user if security is determined to be compromised.” Neither Nii nor Fairman appear to disclose or fairly suggest a condition where security is determined to be compromised. Claim 21 recites **“sending a different decryption key seed to a user if security is determined to be compromised.”** Thus, claim 21 is allowable over the prior art of record.

As claim 21 has been amended to recite the subject matter of claim 25, **“if the predetermined decryption key has not been received from the key FOB, displaying the data on the display screen in a form selected from the group consisting of markings other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled text other than in the non-encrypted form, jumbled numbers other than in the non-encrypted form, and symbols other than in the non-encrypted form,”** claim 21 is also allowable for the reasons claim 25 is allowable.

Claim 22 recites “A method as in claim 21 wherein the step of transmitting the decryption key from the key FOB comprises transmitting the decryption key by a wireless transmitter in the key FOB.” Apparently, in Nii, the keys are transmitted through wired or direct contact connections (e.g. paragraph 0060). Fairman appears to disclose a secure module 4 in customer terminal 3. Neither Nii nor Fairman appear to disclose a decryption key is transmitted from a key FOB by a wireless transmitted in the key FOB. Thus, claim 22 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

Claim 27 recites “A method as in claim 21, wherein **the decryption key seed is periodically changed.**”

The Patent Office appears to consider Kori to no longer be necessary in rejecting claim 27 although claim 27 depends from claim 1, which was rejected over Nii in view of Kori.

Nii does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper decryption key. Fairman is directed to encrypting a series of application data units (ADUs) each with a different key and does not remedy the deficiency of Nii, as discussed above. Thus, claim 27 is allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nii.

Claim 11 recites “A display security system as in claim 10 wherein the display device comprises means for deleting the decryption key stored in the memory upon a predetermined event.”

Claim 12 recites “A display security system as in claim 11 wherein the means for deleting the decryption key stored in the memory can delete the decryption key periodically or after passage of a predetermined period of time after a predetermined event.”

Claim 16 recites “A display system as in claim 13 wherein the memory comprises a volatile memory.”

Claim 19 recites “A display system as in claim 13 wherein the decrypting system comprises means for deleting the decryption key in the memory upon a predetermined event.”

Claim 20 recites “A display system as in claim 13 wherein the decrypting system comprises means for deleting the decryption key in the memory periodically.”

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

As noted on page 5, lines 6-10, of the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006, "Nii does not disclose that when a proper decryption key is not received, the system will display markings other than the decrypted data. In other words, Nii does not disclose *and wherein the display device is adapted to display markings other than actual data on the display when the receiver does not receive decryption key from key FOB.*" Applicant agrees with the Patent Office about the deficiency of Nii vis-à-vis claims 1 and 13. Kori, as noted above, does not remedy this deficiency of Nii. Applicant wonders how claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 1 through intervening claim 10, and claims 16, 19, and 20, which depend from claim 13, are made obvious by Nii when the Patent Office recognizes the deficiency of Nii in rejecting base claims 1 and 13.

Applicant believes that claims 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20, if only for the deficiency of Nii recognized by the Patent Office on page 5, lines 6-10, of the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006.

Regarding the deletion of a decryption key, Applicant requests that a teaching from the prior art be provided or the provision of an affidavit by the patent examiner declaring the patent examiner's knowledge regarding the subject matter the patent examiner is expounding upon (see page 13, line 17, through page 14, line 6, of the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2006).

Nii appears to neither disclose nor fairly suggest the deletion of keys. Thus, claims 11, 12, 19, and 20 are allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason.

Claim 16 is allowable because it depends from allowable claim 13.

Applicant would appreciate that the Patent Office acknowledge the allowability of claims 11, 12, 16, 19, and 20, or remove the finality of the last Office Action.

The Patent Office rejected claims 5, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nii as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 21, 22, and 25 above, and further in view of Ronzani, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0163486.

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

Claim 5 recites “A display security system as in claim 1 wherein the display device comprises a frame adapted to be placed on a user's head, and wherein the electrical display comprises a screen adapted to be located in front of the user's eye.”

Claim 14 recites “A display system as in claim 13 wherein the frame comprises an eyeglass frame.”

Claim 18 recites “A display system as in claim 17 wherein the second receiver comprises a wireless radio frequency receiver.”

Nii, as discussed above, does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper IC card. As Nii is directed to kiosks, Nii does not appear to be intended for use in eyeglasses or as part of a head mounted display. Ronzani is directed to a head mounted display, but does not disclose or fairly suggest encryption or decryption. Thus, claims 5, 14, and 18 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office rejected claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination Nii and Ronzani, and further in view of Fukushima.

Claim 28 recites “A display system as in claim 14, wherein **the frame comprises a sensor for sensing when the frame is removed from a user's head.**”

Claim 29 recites “A display system as in claim 28 wherein **the decryption key is deleted upon sensing that the frame has been removed from the user's head.**”

Nii, as discussed above, does not appear to be amenable modification to display unencrypted data since Nii (e.g., paragraphs 0004, 0005, 0006, 0011-0018, 0022, 0024, 0069, 0073, 0075, 0078, 0103, claim 13) appears to be directed to kiosk environments where users are very unlikely to favor displays with encrypted data that they cannot read because they lack the proper IC card. As Nii is directed to kiosks, Nii does not appear to be intended for use in eyeglasses or as part of a head mounted display. Ronzani and Fukushima are directed to head



S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

mounted displays, but neither appear to disclose or fairly suggest encryption or decryption. Thus, claims 28 and 29 are allowable over the prior art of record.

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Nii or 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Nii, alone or in combination with Kori, Doyle, Fairman, Ronzani, and/or Fukushima, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-29 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

S.N.: 10/090,699  
Art Unit: 2137

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski April 19, 2006  
Walter J. Malinowski Date

Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400, extension 19  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

4/19/06      Ann Okrentowich  
Date      Name of Person Making Deposit